United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.3

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
23 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 6
Provisional agenda for the fifty-eighth session

Draft provisional agenda for the fifty-eighth session of the Committee

Note by the Secretariat

1. In accordance with paragraph 2 (e) of Economic and Social Council resolution 1979/41 and paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 34/50, the Committee shall submit to the Council and to the Assembly, for their review, the provisional agenda for its fifty-eighth session, together with the required documentation.

2. In its decision 1983/163, the Economic and Social Council requested the Secretary-General to bring to the attention of intergovernmental and expert bodies, before decisions were adopted, any request for documentation that exceeded the ability of the Secretariat to prepare and process on time and within its approved resources, and to draw the attention of intergovernmental bodies to areas where duplication of documentation was likely to occur and/or where opportunities for integrating or consolidating documents that dealt with related or similar themes might exist, with a view to rationalizing documentation.

3. The draft provisional agenda for the fifty-eighth session of the Committee is set out below. It has been prepared on the basis of existing legislative mandates and will be completed at the end of the current session in the light of the recommendations adopted by the Committee.

Draft provisional agenda for the fifty-eighth session of the Committee

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Programme questions:
   (a) Programme performance;

17-10405 (E) 280617

Please recycle

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on programme performance for the biennium 2016-2017

(b) Programme planning;

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on the proposed strategic framework for the period 2020-2021: part one, plan outline, and part two, biennial programme plan (General Assembly resolutions 59/275, 62/224 and 71/6)

(c) Evaluation.

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the evaluation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the programme evaluation of the International Trade Centre (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the programme evaluation of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the programme evaluation of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-fifth session on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (General Assembly resolution 70/8)

4. Coordination questions:

(a) Report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination;

Documentation

Annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2017 (Economic and Social Council resolution 2008 (LX))

(b) New Partnership for Africa's Development.

Documentation

Report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development (General Assembly resolution 59/275)

5. Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit.

6. Provisional agenda for the fifty-ninth session.

7. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-eighth session.

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
30 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

I. Organization of the session

1. The Committee for Programme and Coordination held its organizational session (1st meeting) on 20 April 2017 and its substantive session from 5 to 30 June 2017 at United Nations Headquarters. It held a total of 15 formal meetings and a number of informal and "informal informal" consultations.

A. Agenda

2. The agenda for the fifty-seventh session, adopted by the Committee at its 1st meeting, was as follows:

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
3. Programme questions:
   (a) Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019;
   (b) Evaluation.
4. Coordination questions:
   (a) Report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination;
   (b) New Partnership for Africa's Development.
5. Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit.

17-10897 (E) 030717

Please recycle

6. Provisional agenda for the fifty-eighth session.

7. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session.

Selection of reports of the Joint Inspection Unit

3. At its 1st meeting, on 20 April, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the note by the Secretariat (E/AC.51/2017/L.2), submitted pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 2008 (LX) and General Assembly resolution 59/267, containing the information that, at its fifty-sixth session, the Committee had decided to defer consideration of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system" (A/70/686) and the comments of the Secretary-General and of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon (A/70/686/Add.1) to its fifty-seventh session. At the same time, the Committee was advised that there were no further relevant reports of the Unit available to submit for consideration by the Committee at its fifty-seventh session.

Programme of work

4. At the same meeting, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the annotated provisional agenda (E/AC.51/2017/1) and the note by the Secretariat on the status of documentation (E/AC.51/2017/L.1) listing the documents for consideration by the Committee.

5. At its 2nd meeting, on 5 June, the attention of the Committee was drawn to the note by the Secretariat on the revised status of documentation (E/AC.51/2017/L.1/Rev.1) listing the documents for consideration by the Committee.

6. At the same meeting, the Committee approved its programme of work with the understanding that adjustments would be made by the Bureau, as necessary, during the course of the session to take into account the pace of discussions.

7. Following the 2nd meeting, informal briefings were held by the Secretary of the Committee, on organizational matters, by the Executive Officer, Department of Management, on logistical matters, and by the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services and the Director, Inspection and Evaluation Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, on evaluation issues.

B. Election of officers

8. At its 1st meeting, the Committee elected, by acclamation, David Stansbury (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) as Chair of the Committee for the fifty-seventh session.

9. At the same meeting, the Committee elected, by acclamation, Vadim Pisarevich (Belarus) as Vice-Chair of the Committee for the session.

10. At its 11th meeting, on 9 June, the Committee elected, by acclamation, Mr. Rodrigo Otávio Penteado Moraes (Brazil) as Rapporteur of the Committee for the session.

11. The members of the Bureau for the fifty-seventh session of the Committee were:

Chair:

David **Stansbury** (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Vice-Chairs:[1]
Vadim **Pisarevich** (Belarus)

Rapporteur:
Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

C. Attendance

12. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented on the Committee:

Argentina	Namibia
Armenia	Pakistan
Bangladesh	Peru
Belarus	Portugal
Brazil	Republic of Korea
Burkina Faso	Russian Federation
Cameroon	Saudi Arabia
China	Senegal
Cuba	Ukraine
Egypt	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Eritrea	United Republic of Tanzania
France	United States of America
Haiti	Uruguay
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)
Iraq	Zimbabwe
Italy	

13. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented by observers:

Algeria	Lebanon
Austria	Mexico
Botswana	Morocco
Chile	Paraguay
El Salvador	Poland
Indonesia	Republic of Moldova

[1] In the absence of any nomination for the position of Vice-Chair from the African States and the Asia-Pacific States, the seats remained vacant at the fifty-seventh session of the Committee.

Japan	Spain
Kenya	Switzerland

14. The following organization was represented as an observer: the European Union.

15. Also present at the session were the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; the Executive Secretary, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe; the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services; the Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security; the Assistant Secretary-General for the United Nations Environment Programme New York Office, the Assistant Secretary-General for Information and Communications Technology and Chief Information and Technology Officer; the Assistant Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services; the United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights; the Deputy Executive Secretary for Programme Support, Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia; the Director and Acting Special Adviser on Africa; the Director of the secretariat of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination; and other senior officials of the Secretariat.

16. The following reports were discussed by videoconference: the consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019 for programme 10: Trade and development and programme 12: Human settlements; the reports of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluations of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia; the Economic Commission for Europe; the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East; and the annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2016.

D. Documentation

17. The list of documents before the Committee at its fifty-seventh session is set out in the annex to the present report.

E. Adoption of the report of the Committee

18. At the 15th meeting, on 30 June, the Chair of the Committee introduced the draft report of the Committee (E/AC.51/2017/L.4 and Add. 1-24) and the draft provisional agenda for its fifty-eighth session (E/AC.51/2017/L.3).

19. At the same meeting, before the adoption of the draft report, the United Kingdom made an amendment to the draft report, by which the paragraph contained in document E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.18 would be inserted into section E of document E/AC.51/2017/L.4 as paragraph 20.

20. The Committee reaffirmed its role as the main subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council for planning, programming and coordination. In that respect, the Committee agreed that all recommendations of the Office of Internal Oversight Services endorsed in the present report should be taken forward, as appropriate, in full accordance with the respective mandates of the bodies concerned.

21. At the same meeting, the Committee adopted the draft report, as orally amended.

22. Also at the same meeting, the Committee adopted the draft provisional agenda for its fifty-eighth session and decided that it would be updated in the light of the resolutions and decisions adopted by the Economic and Social Council at its 2017 session and by the General Assembly at its seventy-second session.

23. Before the closure of the session, statements were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Cuba, Ukraine and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Chair made concluding remarks.

Annex

List of documents before the Committee at its fifty-seventh session

A/71/6/Rev.1	Biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2018-2019
A/72/84 and Corr.1 and 2 and A/72/84/Add.1	Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019
	Relevant sections (issued as fascicles) of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019
A/72/6 (Sect. 3)	Political affairs
A/72/6 (Sect. 12) and Corr.1	Trade and development
A/72/6 (Sect. 15)	Human settlements
A/72/6 (Sect. 29E)	Office of Information and Communications Technology
A/72/6 (Sect. 34)	Safety and security
A/72/73/Rev.1	Report of the Secretary-General on the proposed revisions to the Regulations and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation (article VII and annex)
A/72/72	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives
E/AC.51/2016/2	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme
E/AC.51/2016/3	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations on the programme evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
E/AC.51/2017/2	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
E/AC.51/2017/3	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
E/AC.51/2017/4	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
E/AC.51/2017/5	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Economic Commission for Europe
E/AC.51/2017/6	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations Department of Political Affairs
E/AC.51/2017/7	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General

E/AC.51/2017/8	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the thematic evaluation of the regional commissions
E/AC.51/2017/9	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights
E/AC.51/2017/10	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for 2017
E/AC.51/2017/11	Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
E/2017/55	Annual overview report of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination for 2016
E/AC.51/2017/12	Report of the Secretary-General on United Nations system support for the New Partnership for Africa's Development
A/70/686	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system"
A/70/686/Add.1	Note by the Secretary-General transmitting his comments and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination on the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system"
E/AC.51/2017/L.3	Note by the Secretariat on the draft provisional agenda and documentation for the fifty-eighth session of the Committee (Economic and Social Council resolution 1894 (LVII))
E/AC.51/2017/L.4 and Add. 1-XX	Draft report of the Committee
E/AC.51/2017/INF/1	List of delegations

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.1

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
9 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(*Item 3 (b)*)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations on the programme evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

1. The Committee resumed its consideration of the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations on the programme evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2016/3), the consideration of which had been deferred from the fifty-sixth session of the Committee (see A/71/16).

Discussion

2. The Committee's discussion on the report, during its fifty-sixth session, is set out in its report (A/71/16, sect. II.C).

17-09444 (E) 130617

Please recycle

Conclusions and recommendations

3. **The Committee for Programme and Coordination expressed its appreciation to the Office for Internal Oversight Services for the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-third session on the programme evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.**

4. **The Committee noted with appreciation that the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs had implemented all of the Committee's recommendations, as reflected in the report.**

5. **The Committee placed particular emphasis on the need for the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to continue to make progress in the use of coordinated joint needs assessments and prioritized humanitarian response plans and for it to contribute, as appropriate, to closer cooperation between humanitarian and development actors.**

6. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly encourage the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to build upon the success highlighted in the triennial review, which presents a strong foundation for that Office to continue to play a leading role in efforts to improve humanitarian response and coordination, including through the Inter-Agency Standing Committee and in cooperation with national agencies of Member States.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.2

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
9 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(Item 3 (b))

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme

1. The Committee resumed its consideration of the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme (E/AC.51/2016/2), the consideration of which had been deferred from the fifty-sixth session of the Committee (see A/71/16).

Discussion

2. The Committee's discussion on the report, during its fifty-sixth session, is set out in its report (A/71/16, sect. II.C).

Conclusions and recommendations

3. **The Committee for Programme and Coordination welcomed the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of recommendations made by the Committee at its fifty-third session on the programme evaluation of the United Nations Environment Programme.**

17-09525 (E)

Please recycle

4. **The Committee noted the conclusion in the report that, out of five recommendations, one had been fully implemented, three had been partially implemented and one had not yet been implemented. The Committee further noted that, subsequent to the issuance of the report, the United Nations Environment Programme had issued operational guidance for regional offices and had thus completed the implementation of the related recommendation.**

5. **The Committee commended the United Nations Environment Programme for the progress it had made in implementing the Committee's recommendations.**

6. **The Committee noted the expressed intention of the United Nations Environment Programme to implement the remaining recommendations fully.**

7. **The Committee expressed its confidence that the United Nations Environment Programme would finalize implementation of the Committee's recommendations as soon as possible in order to become even more effective in assisting Member States especially when establishing, in line with its mandate, clear and transparent criteria for allocating resources to the thematic activities, based on results-based management.**

17-09125

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.3

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
14 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Report(s) of the Joint Inspection Unit
(Item 5)

Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system

1. The Committee resumed its consideration of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system" (see A/70/686) and the comments of the Secretary-General and those of the United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination thereon (see A/70/686/Add.1), the consideration of which had been deferred from the fifty-sixth session of the Committee (see A/71/16).

Discussion

2. The Committee's discussion on the report, during its fifty-sixth session, is set out in its report (A/71/16, sect. IV).

17-09809 (E) 160617

Please recycle

Conclusions and recommendations

3. **The Committee expressed satisfaction that the reports of the Joint Inspection Unit were once again being submitted for consideration and reaffirmed that one of the key mandates of the Committee was to assist the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly on coordination questions. It recommended that the Assembly urge the Unit to intensify its efforts to introduce relevant reports to the Committee.**

4. **The Committee emphasized the need for the implementation of all the recommendations of the Joint Inspection Unit that had been endorsed by intergovernmental bodies and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to invite the executive heads of the participating organizations to continue to provide information to the relevant intergovernmental bodies on the status of implementation of the Unit recommendations addressed to them.**

5. **The Committee took note of the report of the Joint Inspection Unit entitled "Analysis of the evaluation function in the United Nations system" and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained therein and request the Secretary-General to expedite, as appropriate, their full and effective implementation.**

6. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to make better use of in-house expertise to carry out evaluations found in the various entities of the Secretariat, drawing upon, in particular, the experience available from the internal and external oversight bodies, notably the Office of Internal Oversight Services, the Board of Auditors and the Joint Inspection Unit.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
16 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(Item 3 (b))

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

1. At its 9th meeting, on 8 June 2017, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (E/AC.51/2017/11).

2. The Assistant Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and, together with representatives of OIOS and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed appreciation for the report, including the recommendations, and supported the balanced analysis of the advocacy work of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Delegations underlined the critical leadership role of the Office in coordinating international humanitarian assistance to people affected by humanitarian crises (for example in South Sudan and the Syrian Arab Republic), and expressed appreciation for the Office's culture of assistance, notwithstanding the increasing volume, magnitude, duration and intensity of crises globally. A delegation requested the Office to consider how it could better capture the staff time and resources it expended in executing its many

17-10005 (E) 210617

Please recycle

advocacy activities, as referenced in paragraphs 14 and 19 of the report. A delegation further requested an update on recommendation 3, regarding preparatory steps in the development of a new advocacy strategy based on evidence, experience and audience insight and including clear advocacy objectives. The delegation emphasized the importance of articulating such objectives in 2018.

4. Delegations noted that there were many countries in which crises had been ongoing for decades, but were no longer well publicized in the media. Referencing paragraph 32 of the report, delegations agreed with the OIOS conclusion that advocacy efforts by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs should systematically include those "forgotten crises" irrespective of their location, and not solely focus on those featured in the media. A delegation emphasized that the Office's attention to crises should be guided by the principles of neutrality and non-discrimination, through the identification of those in need above all other considerations. A delegation contrasted the examples of the Syrian Arab Republic, where the Office had issued 127 advocacy outputs between 2013 and 2016; Yemen, where the number of persons in need was 1.5 times higher and yet the Office had issued only 64 advocacy outputs; and African countries (see E/AC.51/2017/11, figure VIII), where the discrimination in advocacy efforts was unacceptable.

5. A delegation underlined the importance of high-level access and the contribution of the presence of Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs staff on the ground (ibid., para. 26 (c)) and emphasized the importance of fostering links with both the humanitarian and diplomatic communities at the field and headquarters levels (in line with recommendation 2). Delegations encouraged the Office to continually raise awareness through its information materials and diplomatic contacts. Delegations enquired as to how the Office coordinated its advocacy activities with other humanitarian organizations, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the International Committee of the Red Cross, and whether OIOS had consulted with those organizations in the course of its evaluation.

6. A delegation underlined the importance of political prudence in advocacy, outputs and publications, noting that officials of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (specifically junior staff members who were not cognizant of politically sensitive situations) had at times crossed political lines in their statements, resulting in the inappropriate politicization of issues. The delegation provided as an example the "dramatization" of a report on the use of illegal tunnels between Gaza and Sinai, which it believed would lead readers to sympathize with the users of the tunnels only, and added that the Office had addressed its concerns as soon as they had been raised.

7. Delegations supported the OIOS conclusions on the need to improve internal coordination within the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, noting in particular the ineffective coordination between its New York and Geneva offices. Delegations urged the Office to take steps to improve the its effectiveness and overall coordination through representatives at all levels in New York, Geneva and field offices acting in a coordinated manner and promoting a unified position without contradicting one another. Delegations underlined the importance of the implementation of an internal coordination mechanism under the authority of the Under-Secretary-General/Emergency Relief Coordinator (recommendation 2).

8. A delegation sought clarification from OIOS as to how it had established that the briefings by the Under-Secretary-General/Emergency Relief Coordinator to the Security Council were a determining factor in the adoption of Council resolutions. The delegation expressed the view that the link had been exaggerated in the report, recalled that providing the Council with briefings on consolidated views of

humanitarian needs was but one function performed by the Coordinator and stated that referring to the number of briefings provided by the Coordinator as an indicator would not be appropriate. It underlined that the Coordinator only addressed the Council at the invitation of its members and that other considerations were brought to bear when the Council adopted resolutions.

9. A delegation expressed concern over the outcomes of the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit and suggested that despite the efforts made leading up to the Summit, not enough had been accomplished to maintain the intergovernmental nature of the event and to allow delegations to intervene to achieve specific outputs.

10. A delegation noted the degree of convergence between the findings of the OIOS evaluation and those of the Functional Review commissioned in 2015 by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. A brief update was sought from the Office on the implementation of the recommendations from the Review. The delegation emphasized the need for the Office to consider both reports in the implementation of management reforms under its organizational transformation process.

Conclusions and recommendations

11. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in paragraphs 60 to 62 of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, while recognizing the need for alignment with all internal management reforms under way within the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.**

12. **The Committee emphasized the importance of advocacy among other components of the mandate and global work of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.**

13. **The Committee emphasized the need for the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to continue the development of an advocacy strategy under its change management process that would include clear objectives and would allow the Office to deploy evidence-based approaches, anchored in the guiding principles of humanitarian emergency assistance, including humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, and noted that the Office could be a more effective voice within the United Nations system for principled humanitarian action.**

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.5

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
19 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation

(Item 5 (b))

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East

1. At its 10th meeting, on 9 June 2017, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) (E/AC.51/2017/3).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and, together with representatives of OIOS and UNRWA, responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Delegations commended UNRWA for its essential contribution to the peace process in the Middle East and for its important humanitarian work in support of Palestine refugees, notably in areas such as education and health and in the improvement of their standard of living (the definition of which was questioned, with a delegation asking whether the standard of living for refugees in Europe was the same as that for refugees in other regions, including Asia). Delegations highlighted that the Agency was operating under increasingly complex and challenging circumstances, owing to constantly evolving external factors.

17-10114 (E) 210617

Please recycle

4. Delegations commented on the lack of resources experienced by the Agency, noting that the number of refugees was constantly increasing, and asked what had been accomplished to broaden the donor base. A delegation emphasized that international commitments to resource mobilization and stabilization were important factors that had further affected the effectiveness of the Agency in meeting the growing needs of Palestine refugees in the region, adding that OIOS could have put forward actionable recommendations in that regard. The delegation recalled that international cooperation, including cooperation among donor countries, was required to ensure that adequate resources were provided. A delegation enquired as to the timeline for the implementation by the Agency of its management response and recommendation action plan, as set out in the annex to the report; what measures had been implemented to improve transparency in the use of resources as an important means of attracting additional funding from the international community; and whether in-kind assistance, such as clothing or means of transportation, from Member States that could not provide cash contributions had been considered, including research on how such contributions would be utilized. In reference to paragraph 12 of the annex to the report, a delegation sought clarification of how a zero-growth budget for 2016 could be reconciled with the unprecedented and ever-increasing number of challenges encountered in the field.

5. Regarding staff resources, a delegation made reference to staff salary scale reform. A delegation acknowledged the need to improve efficiency, while commenting that the ratio of staff to population served was insufficient given the limitations that Palestine refugees faced with regard to livelihoods.

6. A delegation queried how the Agency worked with the United Nations Development Programme, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the World Food Programme to increase international mediation on hotspot issues, training and relief assistance associated with peace efforts and to address symptoms and root causes of problems faced by Palestine refugees.

7. Delegations enquired about the timing and data limitations associated with the evaluation, including: (a) whether the report had been completed in 2015 or 2016; (b) the reasons behind the exclusion of human rights work from the evaluation (para. 13); (c) the reasons behind the scarcity of reliable UNRWA-generated data (para. 15); (d) whether the Agency had been unwilling to provide evidence for its claims of progress in implementing OIOS recommendations or merely unable to do so before the report's finalization (para. 67); and (e) whether an attempt had been made to obtain data on or the views of Palestine refugees in the Syrian Arab Republic, which appeared to be missing from data collected, and more broadly what difficulties the Agency was encountering in reaching and delivering services to that population.

8. A delegation sought clarification of whether the new 2016-2021 medium-term strategy incorporated the Sustainable Development Goals for the period 2015-2030, while underlining that the basis of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development was to leave nobody behind, and whether a reference to the 2030 Agenda could foster the channelling of necessary resources in support of the work of the Agency.

9. In line with recommendation 1, a delegation called for a stronger monitoring and evaluation function within the Agency so as to strengthen accountability in relation to the use of resources, to monitor the implementation of the 2016-2021 medium-term strategy in order to allow the Agency to deliver cost-efficiencies and to improve targeted core service delivery to those refugees most in need. A delegation expressed the view that monitoring and evaluation were crucial to improve internal management and the ability of the Agency to implement its mandate, to increase contributions from the international community, while taking

into account new challenges that might arise, and to improve the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.

Conclusions and recommendations

10. The Committee noted the challenging operational context in which UNRWA worked, commended it on its delivery of services to Palestine refugees despite those challenges and recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in paragraphs 68 and 70 of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of UNRWA, while noting that it was important for UNRWA to strengthen its accountability framework and its results-based monitoring and evaluation functions.

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.6

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
19 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(*Item 3 (b)*)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives

1. At its 3rd meeting, on 5 June 2017, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives (A/72/72).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and, together with representatives of OIOS, responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Delegations noted the continued importance of evaluation in enhancing accountability, efficiency and effectiveness, learning and decision-making across the Secretariat and expressed appreciation for the comprehensive report. Several delegations endorsed the recommendations made in the report, which were aimed at aligning the timing of evaluations, programme planning, budgeting and outputs and at providing greater clarity in the use of evaluation budgets. A delegation enquired as to whether an overlap existed between triennial reviews and annual assessments. Some delegations expressed general satisfaction with the improvements reported in

17-10151 (E) 210617

Please recycle

the evaluation functions within offices and departments across the Secretariat. A delegation saw the need for more visible follow-up by the offices reviewed.

4. Several delegations sought clarification on whether OIOS had provided guidance to entities on how their reports could be improved. Clarification was further sought on the role of OIOS in undertaking evaluations, conducting follow-up on the gaps raised in the report and its ability to support and guide entities in strengthening their respective evaluation functions. A delegation observed that, in the report, reference had been made to data collection only, and not data processing, and enquired as to how the limitations listed in paragraph 3 of the report were being addressed.

5. Regarding table 1 of the report, a delegation observed that the overall situation had improved since 2015 in terms of the number of entities which had no evaluation unit and no evaluation activity, while cautioning against duplication of efforts and resources with regard to departments with an independent evaluation unit located in duty stations such as New York, which also had an OIOS presence. In that regard, OIOS was encouraged to identify efficiencies, and the need for an independent evaluation unit was questioned. In terms of the Organization's risk management plan the same delegation underlined that more attention should be given to the Department of Management, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women) in terms of managing extrabudgetary resources.

6. Regarding figures 4 and 5 and paragraph 12 of the report, delegations enquired about the use of a standardized methodology and quality control across entities and about the development of the screening criteria, how they were used and how they were monitored across entities.

7. Several delegations drew attention to the issues discussed in paragraph (d) of the summary and section D of the report regarding how a difference of 90 per cent or more had been observed between resources allocated to discretionary self-evaluation and the costs of producing evaluation reports for 13 entities, thus suggesting the limited accuracy of reported budgets and the inclusion of activities that did not result in the production of evaluation reports under the discretionary self-evaluation allocation. Delegations enquired as to how OIOS had addressed the mismatch between allocated resources and expenditure on evaluations, to ensure better alignment in the future.

8. In reference to paragraph 21 of the report, one delegation enquired as to whether the impact of the revised guidelines issued to budget and evaluation focal points on the reporting of evaluation allocations could be shared before 2019, such as at the first resumed session in March 2018 of the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly, taking into consideration the fact that the information would feed into the consideration by the Assembly of the various reform initiatives on peacekeeping operations and management planned to be submitted by the Secretary-General.

9. A number of delegations expressed concern over the quality and impact of evaluation reports (including the impact of page limitations placed on putting forward recommendations), and noted in particular the high proportion of non-actionable recommendations emerging from the evaluations, as cited in paragraph 16 of the report. In that regard, delegations sought clarification as to why such recommendations had been considered non-actionable, whether they had been aimed at programmes or subprogrammes, and what measures could be taken to address the issue. Some delegations further noted the high proportion of recommendations that were not implemented and queried whether the low rate of

implementation of recommendations was uniformly problematic across entities or whether certain entities faced the problem more acutely than others.

10. Recalling paragraph 28 of the report, regarding the development of usable recommendations, one delegation remarked that the weak nature of recommendations called into question their value and the utility and impact of reports, which undermined the evaluation function at large, and enquired whether a realistic action plan had been established to improve the implementation of recommendations. Another delegation enquired whether conducting participatory evaluations, as described in paragraph 27 of the report, facilitated the success and utility of evaluations.

11. Some delegations expressed the expectation that evaluation policies and reports should support the Sustainable Development Goals. In this regard, a delegation referred to the United Nations Evaluation Group meeting held in May 2017 in Vienna, which focused on seven of the Goals.

12. Delegations enquired about the entities which had not undertaken any evaluation activity during the biennium, as well as those that did not yet have an evaluation policy. In reference to paragraph 22 of the report, on the limited evaluation practice in some entities, one delegation highlighted the fact that six entities had not submitted reports, despite the allocation of evaluation funds, and underlined the need for an improved mechanism to address that issue and ensure the delivery of expected outputs. One delegation highlighted that the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia had carried out evaluations with limited resources and enquired as to whether other entities could follow that example of good practice. Building on that observation, another delegation enquired as to the existence of a single recommendation on expenditure for the preparation of such evaluations. Some delegations appreciated efforts made by the Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services in supporting the establishment of evaluation policies across the six entities, noting the importance of senior management support in establishing an evaluation culture across the Organization, and ensuring that offices involved were "in sync". A delegation requested information on the measures taken by the Executive Office of the Secretary-General to strengthen evaluation.

13. Some delegations objected to the reference in the report, to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) people as a vulnerable population or "persons with specific needs", stressing that there was no consensus on the matter. Serious concern was raised over carrying out non-consensual activities and using non-consensual terms in the reports submitted to the Committee for Programme and Coordination. Some delegations noted that LGBT was an agreed United Nations term, as shown by Human Rights Council resolutions 17/19 of 17 June 2011, 27/32 of 26 September 2014 and 32/2 of 30 June 2016.

14. Regarding section V of the report, on the overall quality of reports and selected results from evaluations conducted in 2014-2015, one delegation enquired as to how the ratings of reports could be improved, why there was a quality deficit and about the systematic deficiencies observed in the reports not rated as excellent. Regarding table 2 in the section, the same delegation expressed concern over the fact that many subprogrammes were not included in the evaluation reports produced in 2014-2015 and sought clarification as to the reasons. Regarding paragraph 37 under the section, a delegation sought clarification on "Development of Africa" and whether it was a reference to the offices in the region or to broader considerations in Africa.

15. Recalling figure XII of the report on the distribution of evaluation reports by priority area in 2014-2015, one delegation noted the lower proportion of evaluations

in the area of peace and security, including peacekeeping operations (which had been carried out in the past and made available to the Committee for consideration), giving rise to the concern that the distribution of evaluation activity across the Secretariat did not appear to be commensurate with the high risk rating given to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support in OIOS risk assessments. One delegation requested further clarity on evaluation priority areas such as the development of Africa, peace and security matters, human rights, sexual abuse and exploitation and gender and observed that presenting a better mix of positive, mixed and negative results from the evaluation reports would be more useful, adding that a more analytical approach to reports with a negative result would increase effectiveness and overall performance.

Conclusions and recommendations

16. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendation contained in paragraph 63 of the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on strengthening the role of evaluation and the application of evaluation findings on programme design, delivery and policy directives.**

17. **The Committee noted with appreciation that most entities housed their evaluation function in a dedicated evaluation unit, that the number of entities with evaluation policies and plans had increased and that many entities had established direct reporting lines from the evaluation unit to the head of the entity.**

18. **The Committee expressed concern regarding the finding of the report on the proportion of evaluation recommendations that are not actionable, and recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to ensure that evaluation recommendations are actionable and that evaluation results are utilized in implementing programme priorities and developing budget requests.**

19. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to make better use of in-house expertise in carrying out evaluations in the entities of the Secretariat, in particular the experience available from the internal and external oversight bodies, notably the Office of Internal Oversight Services, the Board of Auditors and the Joint Inspection Unit.**

20. **The Committee stressed the need for improvement in the quality of evaluation and noted that the Office of Internal Oversight Services had identified good practices such as strategic planning and participatory evaluations.**

21. **The Committee reiterated its recommendation that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to take concrete steps to increase buy-in from senior leadership and strengthen the culture of evaluation and accountability throughout the Organization. The Committee highlighted the importance of ensuring that senior managers' compacts include adequate programme objectives and performance measures in order to fulfil given mandates in accordance with the relevant regulations and rules and that the evaluation function receives due consideration in their performance appraisal.**

22. **The Committee emphasized that evaluation was a key function for the adoption of budgetary decisions, since it not only helped to improve programme design and execution, as well as the formulation of policy**

directives, but also contributed to transparency and the efficient use of resources in the effective implementation of intergovernmental mandates.

23. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly request the Secretary-General to take further action to strengthen the evaluation functions, such as the development of evaluation structures in Secretariat entities that currently lack them, the tracking of evaluation workplans and enhancements to staff evaluation expertise.**

24. **The Committee emphasized that the evaluation function, in particular self-evaluation, was an essential managerial tool and that senior managers had a responsibility to use evaluation to improve performance.**

25. **The Committee expressed concern that a large proportion of subprogrammes had not been subject to evaluation reports during 2014-2015 and that some priority areas, such as justice and law and disarmament, had received minimal evaluation coverage.**

26. **The Committee selected the following reviews for consideration at its fifty-eighth session, in 2018: the triennial reviews of the implementation of recommendations from the 2015 evaluations for UNHCR, UN-Women, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the International Trade Centre, the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Human Settlements Programme.**

27. **The Committee selected the following evaluations for consideration at its fifty-ninth session, in 2019: the Offices of the Special Representatives of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict, on Sexual Violence in Conflict and on Violence Against Children; the Department of Public Information; the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management; the Office for Disarmament Affairs; the Department of Management; UNHCR; the Office of Legal Affairs and the United Nations Environment Programme.**

E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.7

Readex
Fiche

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.7

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
21 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019

(*Item 3 (a)*)

Report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019

Programme 28
Safety and security

1. At its 12th and 13th meetings, on 12 and 13 June 2017, the Committee for Programme and Coordination considered the report of the Secretary-General on consolidated changes to the biennial programme plan as reflected in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019 (A/72/84 and Corr.1 and 2).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security introduced the programme and responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Some delegations expressed appreciation for the efforts made by the Department of Safety and Security in working closely with the Office of Information and Communications Technology to ensure the safety of staff and the security of information. In view of the challenges arising from the different forms of danger and attacks that posed a threat to physical safety and cybersecurity at United

Please recycle

Nations Headquarters and field locations, clarification was sought regarding the extent of the involvement of the Department in mitigating the risks, particularly in the field, in order to guarantee information security.

4. Some delegations sought further clarification on the difference between the language proposed for removal from programme 28, Safety and security, of the Biennial programme plan and priorities for the period 2018-2019 (A/71/6/Rev.1) and the language proposed for addition to programme 25, Management and support services. As a result of the changes in subprogramme 3, Field support, of programme 28, clarification was sought as to whether the capacity to locate staff members and eligible dependants at all United Nations locations worldwide would remain a function of the Department of Safety and Security, as that was not reflected in the proposal of the Office.

Conclusions and recommendations

5. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly approve the changes to the narrative of programme 28, Safety and security, as set out in the report of the Secretary-General (A/72/84 and Corr.1 and 2) and in section 34, Safety and security, of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2018-2019 (A/72/6 (Sect. 34)).**

17-09921

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.8

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
22 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Pentrodo Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(Item 5 (b))

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia

1. At its 6th meeting, on 7 June 2017, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) (E/AC.51/2017/4).

2. The Assistant Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and, together with the Deputy Executive Secretary of ESCWA and representatives of OIOS, responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed their appreciation for and concurred with the recommendations in the report of OIOS, noting that it contained useful and invaluable assessments of ESCWA and how it had adapted and reprioritized its available resources to respond to the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Delegations also recognized the efforts undertaken by ESCWA to carry out its work against the backdrop of the complex regional context within which it was operating.

4. Observations were also made about the management response to the report provided by ESCWA on how it intended to move forward with the recommendations made by OIOS, and one delegation noted with appreciation the promptness of

17-10400 (E) 230617

Please recycle

ESCWA action in addressing, making progress in and moving forward with the implementation of those recommendations.

5. One delegation sought clarification on the methodology used in the report pertaining to the extent to which survey responses had been used as the sole method to support the results, as opposed to triangulation with other sources of data. Clarification was also sought on the support that ESCWA had provided on the substantive servicing of the regional intergovernmental processes, noting that the evaluation methodology did not cover the programme of work of ESCWA relating to conference management services and administration, even though in paragraph 22 of the report mention was made of the important broker role played by ESCWA in the region and its effectiveness in facilitating regional and thematic forums in support of regional decision-making.

6. Clarification was sought on the normative role of ESCWA versus its capacity-building and technical assistance role, especially in the light of the support that it provided to countries in implementing the 2030 Agenda, and on how such activities undertaken by regional commissions dovetailed with the activities of the specialized funds and programmes, which themselves played a normative role in development. A delegation indicated that the real structure of publications was troubling and indicated that, from a results-based perspective, there were deficient dissemination practices and feedback mechanisms with regard to publications (E/AC.51/2017/4, para. 34).

7. A question was raised about the role of ESCWA in consensus building and facilitating decision-making and dialogue, noting that a resolution recently adopted contained contentious language that resulted in a vote on the resolution, as opposed to its adoption by consensus.

8. One delegation questioned the percentage of resources allocated for gender-related activities as reflected in the subprogramme for the advancement of women and for the conflict mitigation and development subprogramme, noting that the budget allocations for the two subprogrammes were relatively low compared with other subprogrammes of ESCWA.

Conclusions and recommendations

9. The Committee recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in paragraphs 58 to 62 of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of ESCWA (E/AC.51/2017/4), subject to the provision below.

10. In addition to the measures set out in recommendation 2, the Committee recommended that the General Assembly encourage the Secretary-General to raise the efficiency of the publications of ESCWA in the areas most useful to its stakeholders and consumers.

United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.9

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
23 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(Item 3 (b))

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General

1. At its 5th meeting, on 6 June 2017, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General (E/AC.51/2017/7).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and, together with representatives of OIOS and of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General, responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed their strong appreciation for the report of OIOS, with many delegations expressing particular appreciation for the usefulness and timing of the report, in particular since results from the evaluation had been shared with the transition team of the Secretary-General designate before he took office. Delegations queried whether, in future, OIOS should continue that good practice in terms of the timing of reports on the evaluation of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General, and if and when a follow-up evaluation of the Executive Office should be conducted. Delegations also expressed appreciation for changes implemented by the Executive Office that responded to the evaluation findings, noting that it was essential that structures were put in place to ensure that the office of the Secretary-General could function and respond to emerging priorities. A

17-10575 (E) 280617

Please recycle

delegation was of the view that the Executive Office should be transparent and provide the necessary information regarding the reform initiatives under way. One delegation further recommended that consideration be given, as a matter of good practice, to OIOS undertaking an evaluation at the end of the term of a Secretary-General.

4. Several delegations raised concerns regarding insufficient time for strategic thinking and policy planning in the Executive Office as indicated in the report of OIOS, and sought clarification about the specific measures that the Executive Office had taken to address the deficiency. Clarification was sought on the issues raised in paragraph 34 of the report, in which it was indicated that holistic, longer-term planning capacities of the Executive Office had declined over time, and in particular, on the approach that was being taken by the team of the current Secretary-General to address that issue.

5. Several delegations highlighted paragraph 39 of the report of OIOS, and sought explanation as to action being taken to address the claims of a lack of an Executive Office unit to pull together analyses from across the system to identify emerging issues or potential crises and follow up on "frozen crises" — those which have disappeared from the news headlines but remain critical from a conflict prevention standpoint.

6. Several delegations sought clarification on the decision-making support provided by the Executive Office, notably in relation to the comments of OIOS in paragraphs 40 to 47 of the report. Clarification was sought on possible measures for improvement. Several delegations sought clarification on whether the work of the Policy Committee, the Management Committee and the Senior Action Group would be absorbed by the newly created Executive Committee. In the event that those committees continued to operate, clarification was sought as to how they would interact to avoid duplication. Some delegations queried the new decision-making structures introduced by the new Secretary-General and the roles of the Executive Committee and Management Committee in relation to one another. Further, clarification was sought on the distinction between the two new senior positions that were established in the Executive Office, namely the Assistant Secretary-General for Strategic Coordination and the Senior Adviser on Policy.

7. As regards paragraphs 48 to 50 of the report, some delegations sought clarification on specific measures that had been taken to avoid the overlap in functions and responsibilities of the Deputy Secretary-General and the Chef de Cabinet, as observed in the past.

8. On the issue of time management of activities of the Executive Office, one delegation expressed concern that insufficient time was dedicated to providing guidance to the wider Organization, and stressed that it was important to "keep the United Nations system electrified by sending out the right pulses to the system", for example, through the Executive Office adopting new approaches in its work and in the hiring of staff for the Office. Several delegations expressed support for efforts being taken to break down the silos within the Executive Office, as well as support for the need to address that issue in the wider United Nations system. Delegations also reaffirmed the role of the Executive Office in directing and not duplicating the work of substantive departments, stressing the importance of transparency and the effective use of human resources.

9. A view was expressed that while many special initiatives had been undertaken, some initiatives were being drawn up without interaction with Member States. One delegation raised questions regarding the Human Rights Up Front initiative (para. 51 of the report), stressing that financial resources continued to be spent on the initiative, despite the fact that no mandate had been provided by an intergovernmental body.

The delegation sought clarification on the status of the unit implementing the initiative, enquiring for example as to whether it was still headed by a D-1 post and whether its placement continued to be in the Executive Office. Further, the delegation noted that the initiative had been funded through voluntary contributions and hence did not have scrutiny by the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly.

10. Some delegations expressed their concerns regarding the level of extrabudgetary resources versus regular budget resources, questioning why the Executive Office was reliant on extrabudgetary funds. It was noted in particular that the analysis and planning capacity within the Executive Office was being financed through extrabudgetary funds, and in view of the issues highlighted in the report of OIOS pertaining to strategic thinking and policy planning, clarification was sought on whether requests for resources would be included in the forthcoming budget proposals.

11. Several delegations expressed concern at the imbalance in the level of staff resources dedicated to the Economic, Social and Development Affairs Unit as compared to that of the Rule of Law Unit and the Political, Peacekeeping, Humanitarian and Human Rights Unit within the Executive Office. Recalling that the Organization was trying to shape a new development agenda, clarifications were sought on measures being taken to address such imbalances.

12. Regarding some inefficiencies in the servicing processes of the Executive Office as highlighted in paragraph 29, some delegations questioned the "trip captain" rotation system, which typically required substantive officers to spend three to four weeks undertaking detailed trip planning, including substantive work on the programme as well as logistics and ceremonial protocol functions, and questioned in particular why no recommendations had been put forward in the report of OIOS to address the issue. As concerns protocol functions, a delegation indicated that the functions should be performed by trained professionals.

13. Different views were expressed as to whether the Committee should make its own recommendations to the Executive Office, separate from those already made by OIOS. A delegation was of the view that the Committee's recommendations should focus on the future so that past mistakes are not repeated, which would help to make the Executive Office effective. One delegation was of the view that it was not convinced that the Committee should make recommendations that would have a formal nature. Notably, the delegation was of the view that the Committee should formulate messages of encouragement about reform but was not convinced that the Committee should go beyond that.

14. Some delegations reiterated that all the initiatives carried out by the Executive Office of the Secretary-General should be in compliance with intergovernmental mandates.

Conclusions and recommendations

15. **The Committee took note of the report of Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Executive Office of the Secretary-General.**